

創価大学
国際仏教学高等研究所
年報

平成13年度
(第5号)

Annual Report
of
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
at Soka University

for the Academic Year 2001

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所
東京・2002・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
Soka University
Tokyo・2002

Miscellaneous notes on Middle Indic words

Seishi KARASHIMA

(1) BHS. *bbikṣave* (< Pā. *bbikkhave*) : “monks!” (vocative plural)

In my recent article, “Some Features of the Language of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*,” in: *Indo-Iranian Journal* 44 (2001), I have pointed out (pp. 207~208) that the vocative plural, *bbikṣave* — a back-formation of the “Māgadhism” *bbikkhave* —, occurs in the Lüshun fragments of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* (SP).

After I had sent the final revision of the above-mentioned article to the publisher, I noticed that there were more occurrences of this noteworthy Middle Indic form in other texts.

One of them is in a fragment of the SP from Khādaliq in the Stein Collection: H 57 Kha. 0011. 3. *durrabbam prādurbhāvam* *bbikṣave* {s}ta(thāgatānā)mm (= do. H 57 Kha. 0011. 5)¹.

The *bbikṣave* occurs also in a Gāndhārī version of the *Mahāpariṇirvāna-sūtra*: Mark Allon and Richard Salomon “Kharosthī fragments of a Gāndhārī version of the Mahāpariṇirvāṇa-sūtra”, in: *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection I, Buddhist Manuscripts*, vol. 1, ed. Jens Braarvig *et al.*, Oslo 2000: Hermes Publishing, p. 245, SC 2179/44b. // [tha] kbu *bbikṣave* maro papimo yena tathaga ///; p. 246, Additional fragment, recto 2. *upasakam upasikam* *bbikṣave* dāmta vyakta vini ///; cf. do. p. 269.

(2) BHS. *pratisarati* : with *anyenānyam* “goes off upon another issue, leads the talk aside, gets off the subject, prevaricates”

The phrase, *anyenānyam pratisarati*, occurs as follows: *The Vinayavastu of the Mūlasarvāstivādin, Gilgit Manuscripts*, ed. N. Dutt, vol. 3, pt. 3, p. 108.7f. *avakāśam kāryamāṇo* *nyenānyam pratisarati*. *bhagavān āha* : “*avacanīyāḥ kartavyāḥ*.” *avacanīyāḥ kṛtāḥ tathāpy* *anyenānyam pratisarati*.

This phrase may mean “He goes off upon another issue” which is the same as Pā. *anñen’ anñam paṭicarati*². A similar form is also found in the *Kāśyapaparivarta* §8 (8b1).

¹ See Hirofumi Toda, *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra, Central Asian Manuscripts, Romanized Text*, Tokushima 1981, p. 268.

² Cf. PTSD, s.v. *paṭicarati*; *The Book of the Discipline (Vinaya-Piṭaka)*, II 164, fn. 4; *Dialogues of the Buddha*,

nānyenānyām pratiniṣṛtya vācā bhāṣate (“He speaks without going off upon another issue.”).

(3) **Gāndhārī** *grahavati* (< Skt. *grhāpati*) : “householder”

Konow noted a long time ago that *grahavati*, found in a Kharoṣṭhī inscription, dated Azes 134 (C.E. 77?), is a Gāndhārī form of Skt. *grhāpati* (“householder”).³ Therefore, this is not a new finding at all. However, what makes me mention this word here is the fact that I have recently found that the puzzling Chinese transliteration 遷羅越 (MC. *kja[ka]*⁴ *lā jwōt*)⁵ in the meaning of “householder” is most probably based on this form (**gra'vat-* < *grahavati*). This word is contained also in the title of the Chinese translation of the *Ugrapariprcchā*, 郁迦迦羅越問菩薩行經⁶ (T.12, No. 323, 23f.; **Ugra-grahavati- ... pariprcchā*)⁷ which has been normally incorrectly back-formed by modern scholars as **Ugra(de)va- ... pariprcchā* or **Ugra-kulapati- ... pariprcchā*.

(4) **Pā = BHS.** *iccbati* : “maintains, holds, claims; accepts, admits, approves of (a theory)”

BHS. *iccbantika* : “one who maintains (a theory), a theorist, pedant”(?)

In the *Visuddhimagga* (ed. C. A. F. Rhys Davids, PTS) the verb *icchatī* occurs several times in the meaning “maintains, claims, thinks of (a theory)” or “approves of, admits”⁸ as follows:

I 116, fn. 2; *The Dispeller of Delusion (Sammobhavinodani)*, II. 273.

³ Sten Konow “Kalawan Copper-plate Inscription of the Year 134”, in: *Epigraphia Indica*, XXI (1931-32), pp. 251-259, n° 39; *do.* “Kalawān Copper-plate Inscription of the Year 134,” in: *JRAS* (1932), pp. 949-965; J. Marshall, *Taxila, An Illustrated Account of Archaeological Excavations*, vol. I, p. 327; Keishō Tsukamoto, *A Comprehensive Study of the Indian Buddhist Inscriptions*, Part I, Text, Notes and Japanese Translation, Kyoto 1996: Heirakuji Shoten, pp. 971-972.

⁴ 遷 frequently interchanges with 伽 (MC. *gja*). Both of them were invented in order to transcribe the Indic velar consonants *k*, *g*.

⁵ This word is found as follows: T.2, No. 144, 868b20-869b2; No. 150a, 875c26f.; T.4, No. 204, 500c6f.; No. 205, 507c7; No. 206, 519b9f.; T.8, No. 221, 3b28, 5c5, 7c10, 9b6, 10c14, 96b29; T.12, No. 337, 84a17, No. 362, 303b3; T.13, No. 418, 903a11; No. 419, 920a-7; T.14, No. 458, 440b15; No. 527, 801c-1, 803a2; No. 553, 899a4f., 901b13; No. 554, 903b13f.; No. 555, 905c19f.; No. 556, 907c-7; No. 563, 915a1f.; T.15, No. 597, 131c1; No. 624, 359a4; No. 626, 392c23, 405a25f.; T.17, No. 805, 750b-16, 750a11f.; T.21, No. 1331, 523a22f.; T.24, No. 1471, 927b1.

⁶ Please read thus instead of 郁迦迦越問菩薩行經 (haplography).

⁷ I wish to thank my colleague, Noriyuki Kudo, for bringing my attention to this transliteration and its problem.

⁸ This meaning of *iccbati* is not recorded in dictionaries including CPD and the newly-published *A Dictionary of Pāli*, by Margaret Cone Oxford 2001 (PTS). The latter dictionary (s.v. *iccbati*¹ [2]) gives “approves, allows, prescribes” to this verb, but only as a grammatical technical term, quoting the *Parāmatthajotikā* II and the *Saddanīti*. Similarly, Monier-Williams’ *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary* (s.v. *अिः*) gives “to acknowledge, maintain, regard, think” also as a grammatical term. Cf. *Points of Controversy or Subjects of Discourse, Being a Translation of the Kathā-vatthu*, by Shwe Zan Aung and Mrs. Rhys Davids

310.20f. *akkharacintakā pana attham avicāretvā “nāmamattam etan” ti icchanti, ye pi attham vicārenti, te sattāyogena(v.l. satta⁹) “sattā”ti icchanti.*^{9, 10}

338.30f. *ārammaṇātikkamato catasso pi bhāvant’ imā / aṅgātikkamam etāsam na icchanti vibhāvino //*¹¹

375.20f. *aṅgārammaṇavavatthāpanam pi eke icchanti, aṭṭhakathāsu pana anāgatattā addhā tam bhāvanāmukham na hoti.*¹²

692.27f. *ye pana nānābbisamayaṁ icchanti tesam uttaram Abhidhamme Kathāvatthusmim vuttam eva*¹³

A similar usage of this verb is also seen in the *Kathāvatthupakkaraṇa-aṭṭhakathā*, ed. N. A. Jayawicrama, London 1979 (PTS), as follows:

37.2f. *Sammitiyā Vajjiputtakā Sabbatthivādino ekacce ca Mahāsanghikā arahato pi(v.l.-) paribāṇim icchanti*¹⁴

41.5f. *tattha ye paranimmitavasavattideve upādāya tad upari devesu maggabhāvanam pi na icchanti seyyathāpi Sammitiyā*¹⁵

85.15f. *tattha ye sabbasmimpi anāgate nānām icchanti, seyyathāpi Andhakā¹⁶ etc. etc.*

The word *icchatī*, with the same meaning as in the above-cited Pāli texts, is also found throughout the *Abhidharmakośa* and in its commentary. For instance¹⁷:

*śailpasthānikasyāpi kasyacid īryāpathikasyātyartham abhyastasyēcchanti*¹⁸

Oxford (PTS), p. xxxiv.

⁹ = *Patīsambhidāmagga-aṭṭhakathā* I 57.20f.

¹⁰ “However, (in the world) etymologists who do not consider meaning have it that it is a mere name, while those who do consider meaning have it that a ‘being’ (*satta*) is so called with reference to the ‘bright principle’ (*satta*)”, *The Path of Purification : Visuddhimagga*, translated from the Pali by Bhikkhu Nāṇamoli, 1956 Colombo: A. Semage; 1991 Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society, pp. 302-303.

¹¹ “While reckoned by surmounting of the object they are four, the wise do not admit surmounting of factors that one can recognize.” (do. 333).

¹² “Some would also have ‘defining of factors and object’; but since that is not given in the commentaries it is certainly not a heading in the development.” (do. 371).

¹³ “But about those who would have it that [the different truths] are penetrated to separately, more is said in the Abhidhamma in the *Kathāvatthu*” (do. 719).

¹⁴ “The Sammitiyas, the Vajjiputtiyas, the Sabbatthivādins, and some of the Mahāsanghikas maintain that an arahan can fall away.” Cf. *The Debates Commentary*, trans. by B. C. Law, Oxford 1989 (PTS), p. 43, where *icchanti* translated as “incline to the belief”.

¹⁵ “But some, for instance the Sammitiyas, do not believe in any Way-culture among the higher devas.” (do. 48)

¹⁶ “But some, for instance the Andhakas consider that insight into any part of the future is possible.” (do. 106).

¹⁷ *Abhidharmakośabhbāṣyam* of *Vasubandhu*, ed. P. Pradhan, revised 2nd edition, Patna 1975, p. 65, l. 19.

¹⁸ “Some admit that even one who is skilled in the arts and one who is well practised and has a good deportment (acquire supernatural powers).”

This was commented upon by Yaśomitra as follows¹⁹:

*icchanti Vaibhāṣikāḥ*²⁰

In the same *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā*, we find also the following set phrase:

40.27, 141.4, 362.21 etc. *tad evam nēcchanti Vaibhāṣikāḥ*²¹

From these examples, it can be clearly seen that the word *icchati*, both in Pāli and Buddhist Sanskrit, is used in contexts where theories or doctrines of a certain school are concerned.

I, further, assume that the word *icchantika* (一闡提 MC. ཡjet tshjän: diei), whose etymology remains obscure²², may be somehow²³ derived from the verb *icchati* in the above-stated meaning.

Numerous characteristics of *icchantikas*, as antagonistic towards Mahāyanists, are described fully in the Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, T.12, No. 374, 418f. From the descriptions found in this Sūtra and elsewhere²⁴, we know that they were by no means outsiders of the Buddhist community, but rather they were, in general, monks, some of whom even looked like arhants or bodhisattvas. Also, they are not depicted as greedy, desirous persons in the scriptures, though modern scholars have defined them as such due to their name being associated with the verb *icchati* “desires”. The common characteristic of these *icchantikas* is that they, as monks, rejected Mahāyāna scriptures and denounced Mahāyānists.

I suppose that those who argued by “maintaining, claiming, or approving of” theories, but at the same time, disapproved of Mahāyāna scriptures, were labelled as *icchantikas*, namely “those who maintain” or “pedants”, by Mahāyānists. In conclusion, *icchantikas* were presumably none other than orthodox monks who discredited Mahāyāna doctrines.

If we accept the above, then, we may understand the play on words, used in the following passage.

tatrēcchantikānām punar Mahāmate anicchantikatā mokṣam kena pravartate? bodhisattvapiṭakanikṣepo 'bhyākhyānām ca nāite sūtrānta-vinaya-mokṣānukūlā iti

¹⁹ *Sphuṭārthā Abhidharmakośavyākhyā: the Work of Yaśomitra*, edited by U. Wogihara, Tokyo 1936: The Publishing Association of Abhidharmakośavyākhyā; Tokyo 1989: Sankibo Buddhist Book Store, p. 152, l. 18.

²⁰ “The Vaibhāṣikas admit.”

²¹ “The Vaibhāṣikas do not admit it.” Cf. also *do. 40.23. tad etad digbhāgabhedavattvam nēcchanti Vaibhāṣikāḥ*.

²² Cf. BHSD, s.v.; IIJ 17(1975), p. 275.

²³ Cf. BHSG § 22.29.

²⁴ Materials, concerning *icchantikas* from various sources, are collected in the following book: Ryōkō Mochizuki, *Daijō Nebangyō no Kenkyū — Kyodanshi teki Kōsatsu* 大乘涅槃經の研究 — 教団史的考察 [Studies on the Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*: An Examination of Institutional History], Tokyo 1988: Shunjūsha, pp. 377ff.

bruvataḥ sarvakusalamūlotsargatvān na nirvāyati ²⁵“How, Mahāmati, is it that those who maintain (*icchantika*) do not have a desire (*icchanti*) for emancipation? ... One, who rejects and denounces the bodhisattva collection (of scriptures), saying that it is not in conformity with the Sūtras, disciplines, and emancipation, will not enter into Nirvāṇa, because he has forsaken all roots of merit (by such deeds).”

(5) BHS. *mano* (< **pano* < Skt. *punar*) “again”

In K. Fujita’s edition of the *Sukhāvatīvyūha*, we find the following verse:

*te puṣpapūṭehi samokiranti
udagracittā atulāya prītiye
vācam prabbāṣanti punas tu nāyake
asmāpi kṣetram siya evarūpam*²⁶

As the first and third lines are problematic, I cite the readings of manuscripts here. First, an older palm-leaf manuscript (abbr. R), dating back to the middle of the 12th century²⁷, now at Ryūkoku University, Kyoto, reads the lines in question as follows:

*te puṣpapūṭohi mano kiranti
vācam prabbāṣanti punas tu nāyake*

Another older palm-leaf manuscript, dating back to 1152/1153 C.E. (abbr. N1), now at the National Archives, Kathmandu, reads as follows:

*te <puṣpa>pūṭohi mano kiranti
bahu²⁸ prabbāṣanti punas tu nāyake*

It is clear, therefore, that the reading of Fujita’s edition differs from these two older manuscripts.

The other extant manuscripts, which are all written on paper and probably not dating back earlier than the 17th century, read the lines in question as follows:

*te puṣpapūṭohi (v.ll. °puṭobhi, pūṭebhi) puno (v.l. puro) kiranti
kāmam (v.l. kāma) prabbāṣanti purasta (v.l. punas ta) nāyake*

Thus, we realise that the reading of Fujita’s edition differs also from these relatively new manuscripts. How did the discrepancies among manuscripts occur and what was the

²⁵ *Lankāvatāra Sūtra*, ed. B. Nanjo, Kyoto 1923, p. 65, l. 17f.

²⁶ Kotatsu Fujita, *The Larger Sukhāvatīvyūha, Romanized Text of the Sanskrit Manuscripts from Nepal*, Tokyo 1992~1996: Sankibo, 3 vols, II, pp. 981~982. Ashikaga’s edition reads as follows: *te puṣpapūṭābi samokiranti / vācam prabbāṣanti punas tu nāyake* // (A. Ashikaga, *Sukhāvatīvyūha*, Kyoto 1965, p. 44, ll. 21~24). Gómez translates this verse, based on the same edition, as follows: “Elated, incomparably jubilant, they shower handfuls of flowers over him, and again they declare this vow before the Leader: ‘May we also have a field like this one!’” (*The Land of Bliss: The Paradise of the Buddha of Measureless Light*, Luis O. Gómez, Honolulu and Kyoto 1996, p. 94).

²⁷ For descriptions of these manuscripts, see Fujita, *op. cit.*, I, p. viif.

²⁸ Probably a corruption of *vācam*.

more original reading?

Concerning the third line, I assume that the readings, *punas tu* and *punas ta*, were corrupted forms of *purastu*, *purasta* (<²⁹ [m.c.] **purastam*³⁰ < Skt. *purastāt*), due to the similarity between the Indian characters *ra* and *na*.

Now, looking at the first line, the readings *puspapūto(b)hi* are probably corruptions of *puspapūte(b)hi*.³¹ However, more problematic is the reading *mano* in the palm-leaf manuscripts. As the paper manuscripts read *puno*³² “again” (< Skt. *punar*), we may assume the word *mano* was used in this meaning, too.

Also, as the bodhisattvas are described, in the verses immediately preceding the verse in question, to have scattered flowers once, the expression “(scatters) again”, therefore, agrees with the context.

I assume the word *mano* in these older palm-leaf manuscripts is a Gāndhārī form, derived from Skt. *punar*: *mano*³³ < **pano*³⁴ < Skt. *punar*, which the Nepalese scribes seem to have recognised correctly as such and rendered it into the regular Buddhist Sanskrit form *puno*, while modern editors of the text misinterpreted it and wrongly back-formed it as *samo-(kiranti)* (prob. < Skt. *saṃ-ava-√kr*) which is not found anywhere else.

We may translate the verse as follows:

“Delighted, they scatter again basketfuls of flowers over (*Amitābha*) with incomparable joy, and they utter the (following) words (*vāc*)³⁵ in front of the Guide: ‘May our field be like this one!’ ”³⁶

²⁹ For the development *-u* < *-am*, see v. Hinüber “Upāli’s Verses in the Majjhimanikāya and the Madhyamāgama”, in: *Indological and Buddhist Studies, Volume in Honour of Professor J. W. de Jong on his Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. L. A. Hercus et al., Canberra 1982; *do. Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick*, Wien 2001: § 297.

³⁰ Cf. Pā. *purattham*. For the ablative in *-am*, cf. v. Hinüber, *op. cit.* § 304.

³¹ The verb *kirati* (“scatters”) is often combined with the ablative form of nouns; cf. PW., s.v. ³*kar*.

³² The reading *puro* in some manuscripts is a corruption of *puno*, due to the similarity between the characters *ra* and *na*.

³³ For *mano* in the Gāndhārī Dharmapada, see John Brough, *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada*, London 1962: §69; for *mana*, *mano* (< Skt. *punar* ?), see Ludwig Alsdorf, *Asokas Separatedikte von Dhauli und Jaigada*, Mainz 1962 (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaft und der Literatur, Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftliche Klasse, Jahrgang 1962, Nr. 1), pp. 26-27 = *Kleine Schriften*, ed. by Albrecht Wezler, Wiesbaden 1974, pp. 486-487.

³⁴ Cf. Pā. *puno*, *pana*.

³⁵ Or “wish” (= *kāma*).

³⁶ The Tibetan translation reads as follows: *dga' zbing mgu ba'i sems ni gzhal yas gyis // de dag gis ni me tog snyim gtor nas // 'dren pa de yi spyan sngar 'di skad du // bdag cag zbing yang 'di 'drar gyur ces smras //* (*The Tibetan Tripitaka, Taipei Edition* 台北版西藏大藏經, Taipei 1991: SMC Publishing, vol. 9, p. 74, 259a7-259b1; *The Tibetan Tripitaka, Peking Edition* 影印北京版西藏大藏經, ed. Daisetz T. Suzuki, Kyoto, Tokyo 1955-1961: Tibetan Tripitaka Research Institute, vol. 22, p. 120, 295a8-295b1).